



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gold in his cure, and making such representations on his labels. *Held*, that where plaintiff falsely represents his goods on his labels, he cannot maintain a suit in equity to protect his business of selling such remedy from invasion and injury by another.

He who comes into equity must come with clean hands. *Bispham on Equity*, Section 42; *Milhous v. Sally*, 43 S. C. 324; *McMullen v. Hoffman*, 174 U. S. 654. There is under this doctrine a distinction between enforcing an illegal contract and getting an accounting of money in the hands of a partner as the result of such a transaction. *Brooks v. Martin*, 2 Wall. 70; *Hardy v. Jones*, 63 Kan. 8. Courts of Equity will not interfere by injunction where there is any lack of truth in plaintiff's case, *i. e.*, where there is any misrepresentation in his trade mark or label. *Browne on Trade Marks*, Section 474, *et seq.*; *Siegart v. Abbot*, 61 Md. 276; *Clotworthy v. Shepp*, 42 Fed. 62; *Josephs v. Macowsky*, 96 Cal. 518; *Koeler v. Sanders*, 122 N. Y. 65. Nor will Chancery interfere by injunction at the suits of the vendor of one quack patent medicine against another, such controversies having too little merit to be commended on either side. *Heath v. Wright*, Fed. Cas. No. 6310. If the plaintiff has been guilty of unconscientious, inequitable or immoral conduct in or about the same matter, whereof he complains of his adversary, or if his claim to relief grows out of or depends upon, or is inseparably connected with his own wrong, he will be repelled at the threshold of the court. *Simmons Medicine Co. v. Mansfield Drug Co.*, 73 Tenn. 84.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE—POLICE POWER—MUNICIPAL REGULATION.—INTERNATIONAL TEXT-BOOK V. INHABITANTS OF CITY OF AUBURN.—A city ordinance provided that "no person shall distribute in any public street or from any buildings, handbills, cards, circulars or papers of any sort, except newspapers."—*Held*, that such an ordinance is a lawful police regulation, to protect people on the street from annoyance, and not unlawful as an interference with interstate commerce as against a concern doing business in another state, and desiring to distribute on the public street circulars advertising such business.

No state has the power to impose a tax upon the occupation or business of any person or company engaged in carrying on interstate commerce. *Case of State Freight Tax*, 15 Wall. 232; *Osborne v. Florida*, 33 Fla. 162; *Com. v. Smith*, 92 Ky. 38; *Crutcher v. Kentucky*, 92 Ky. 38. A power exercised in good faith for public order and comfort will be recognized by U. S., although it may bear on the agencies of commerce. *Freund on Police Power*, Section 159. The power of the state to protect the lives, health and property of its citizens, and to preserve good order and public morals is a power originally and always belonging to the states, and not surrendered by them to the general government. *Cooley on Const. Law*, 3rd Ed., p. 79; *U. S. v. E. C. Knight Co.*, 156 U. S. 1, 11. The states have full power to regulate within their limits matters of internal police. *Escanaba Co. v. Chicago*, 107 U. S. 683.

JUDGMENTS—DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE—ACTIONS AT LAW AND IN EQUITY.—SMITH ET AL. V. COWELL, ET AL., 92 PAC. 20.—*Held*, that a decree of dismissal without prejudice to any "action at law" rendered by a Federal Court or sustaining a demurrer to the complaint in equity on the grounds that the plaintiff was not entitled to the equitable relief prayed for, is a bar